



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/720,493	11/24/2003	John D. Wydner	01-0810.07	4551

21491 7590 04/29/2005

LANIER FORD SHAVER & PAYNE
P O BOX 2087
HUNTSVILLE, AL 35804

EXAMINER

REIS, TRAVIS M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2859

DATE MAILED: 04/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

H.A

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/720,493

Applicant(s)

WYDNER, JOHN D.

Examiner

Travis M. Reis

Art Unit

2859

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 March 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 14-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 14-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 March 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 3 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 3 recites the limitation "said light-reflective material" in lines 1-2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-10, 12, 15, 16, & 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jio (U.S. Patent 5179768) in view of Bass (U.S. Patent 6264335).

Jio discloses a plastic apparatus (Abstract) comprising an integrally formed unitary clip member (Figure 2) having two extension arms (2, 3) connected by a tensioned member (4) therebetween; wherein each of said extension arms has an engagement end and a remote end and an outer surface and an inner surface; and wherein said tensioned member is located generally along said apparatus about two thirds of the distance from said engagement end to said remote end from said engagement end (Figure 3); wherein said interior surface of each of said extension arms at their respective engagement ends has a surface treatment comprising a serrated edge (22, 32) for enhancing the frictional interaction between said apparatus and its point of attachment (Figure 2), further including an exterior surface of each of said remote ends of each of said extension arms has a surface treatment for enhancing the frictional interaction between said apparatus and said user comprising a

Art Unit: 2859

raised textured surface (21, 31) (Figure 3); and said integral tension member is curvilinear (Figure 2) so as to allow for sufficient flexing of said integral tensioned member to enable said apparatus to separate said engagement ends of said extension arms when said remote ends of said extension arms are forced toward one another. Furthermore, it has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed (i.e. to enhance bad weather and nighttime use of the apparatus) does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. Ex parte Masham, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987).

Jio does not disclose on an outer surface of each of said extension arms is a light-reflective sticker.

Bass discloses a light reflective marking clip (5) with light reflective stickers (1) attached to outer surfaces of each of said extension arms (Figure 4) in order to be easily locatable, wherein Webster's dictionary defines "sticker" as "one that adheres or causes adhesion." Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to add the light reflective stickers disclosed by Bass to make the clip disclosed by Jio in order that the clip made easily locatable.

With respect to the preamble of the claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-10, 12, 15, 16, & 18: the preamble of the claim does not provide enough patentable weight because it has been held that a preamble is denied the effect of a limitation where the claim is drawn to a structure and the portion of the claim following the preamble is a self – contained description of the structure not depending for completeness upon the introductory clause. Kropa v. Robie, 88 USPQ 478 (CCPA 1951).

4. Claims 3, 14, & 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jio & Bass, further in view of Beebe (U.S. Patent 5669327).

Jio & Bass disclose all of the instant claimed invention as stated above in the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-10, 12, 15, 16, & 18, but do not disclose on an outer surface of each of said extension arms is light reflective paint.

Beebe discloses a biodegradable trail marker (10) which is coated with a light reflective dye/paint in order to be easily identified at night (col. 2 line10-13; col. 3 line 6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to add the dye/paint coating disclosed by Beebe to the outer surface of said extension arms disclosed by Jio & Bass in order to be easily identified at night.

5. Claims 11, 19, & 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jio & Bass as applied to claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-10, 12, 15, 16, & 18 above, and further in view of Ryder.

Jio & Bass disclose all of the instant claimed invention as stated above in the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-10, 12, 15, 16, & 18, but do not disclose the clip member is orange.

Ryder discloses a trail marker (10) made of plastic colored with a orange pigment to reflect light in order to make it readily visible over considerable distances (col. 2 lines 29-34). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to add the orange pigment coloring the trail marker disclosed by Ryder to the clip disclosed by Jio & Bass in order to enhance its visibility over considerable distances.

6. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 9, 10, 12, 15, 17, & 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hatayan (U.S. Patent 4079765) in view of Bass.

Hatayan discloses a plastic apparatus comprising an integrally formed unitary clip member (Abstract) having two extension arms (11, 12) connected by a tensioned member (10) therebetween (Figures 1 & 2); wherein each of said extension arms has an engagement end (13, 13A) and a remote end (14, 14A) and an outer surface and an inner surface (Figure

2); and wherein said tensioned member is located generally along said apparatus about two thirds of the distance from said engagement end to said remote end from said engagement end (Figure 2); wherein said interior surface of each of said extension arms at their respective engagement ends has a surface treatment comprising a scalloped edge (21) for enhancing the frictional interaction between said apparatus and its point of attachment (Figure 2) further including said integral tension member is curvilinear (Figure 2) so as to allow for sufficient flexing of said integral tensioned member to enable said apparatus to separate said engagement ends of said extension arms when said remote ends of said extension arms are forced toward one another.

Hatayan does not disclose on an outer surface of each of said extension arms is a light-reflective sticker.

Bass discloses a light reflective marking clip (5) with light reflective stickers (1) attached to outer surfaces of each of said extension arms (Figure 4) in order to be easily locatable, wherein Webster's dictionary defines "sticker" as "one that adheres or causes adhesion." Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to add the light reflective stickers disclosed by Bass to make the clip disclosed by Hatayan in order that the clip be made easily locatable.

With respect to the preamble of the claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 9, 10, 12, 15, 17, & 18: the preamble of the claim does not provide enough patentable weight because it has been held that a preamble is denied the effect of a limitation where the claim is drawn to a structure and the portion of the claim following the preamble is a self – contained description of the structure not depending for completeness upon the introductory clause. **Kropa v. Robie**, 88 USPQ 478 (CCPA 1951).

7. Claims 10 & 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Posey in view of Bass & Beebe.

Posey discloses a metal apparatus (col. 1 line 59) comprising an integrally formed unitary clip member (10) (Figure 2) having two extension arms (27, 28) connected by a tensioned member (18) therebetween; wherein each of said extension arms has an engagement end and a remote end and an outer surface and an inner surface; and wherein said tensioned member is located generally along said apparatus about two thirds of the distance from said engagement end to said remote end from said engagement end (Figures 2 & 4).

Posey does not disclose on an outer surface of each of said extension arms is a light-reflective sticker.

Bass discloses a light reflective marking clip (5) with light reflective stickers (1) attached to outer surfaces of each of said extension arms (Figure 4) in order to be easily locatable, wherein Webster's dictionary defines "sticker" as "one that adheres or causes adhesion." Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to add the light reflective stickers disclosed by Bass to make the clip disclosed by Posey in order that the clip be made easily locatable.

Posey discloses all of the instant claimed invention as stated above in the rejection of claims 10 & 21, but does not disclose on an outer surface of each of said extension arms is light reflective orange paint.

Beebe discloses a biodegradable trail marker (10) which is coated with an orange light reflective dye/paint in order to be easily identified at night (col. 2 line10-13; col. 3 line 6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to add the dye/paint coating disclosed by Beebe to the outer surface of said extension arms disclosed by Posey in order to be easily identified at night.

With respect to the preamble of the claims 10 & 21-23: the preamble of the claim does not provide enough patentable weight because it has been held that a preamble is denied the effect of a limitation where the claim is drawn to a structure and the portion of the claim following the preamble is a self – contained description of the structure not depending for completeness upon the introductory clause. *Kropa v. Robie*, 88 USPQ 478 (CCPA 1951).

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 3, 10, 11, & 14-23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

9. With reference to claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-9, 12, & 24, in response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., a flexible, removable element; a substantially two-dimensional surface for reflection of light) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to

Art Unit: 2859

37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Travis M. Reis whose telephone number is (571) 272-2249. The examiner can normally be reached on 8--5 M--F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Diego Gutierrez can be reached on (571) 272-2245. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306 for all communications.

Travis M Reis
Examiner
Art Unit 2859

tmr
April 26, 2005



Diego Gutierrez
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800

CHRISTOPHER W. FULTON
PRIMARY EXAMINER